

The Jury in the case of Herbert had not been to agree up to a late hour last night. It is understood that they stand ten for acquittal and for conviction.

Proverbs are generally true, and there is none truer than the one which declares that some men are born with a silver spoon in their mouths. Indeed, the spoon in some cases is of silver-gilt, if not of solid gold. To this fortunate class, thus happy by the mere circumstance of being born, we should append the dual house of Grafton must belong. We notice by the English papers that dur-

The princes and rulers that have lorded it over our Yankee heritage for the last seventy years, have a much more expeditious and economical method of disposing of their irregular descendants than this we have been considering. It consists simply of selling them themselves, or leaving their assets in the hands of their heirs, executors, administrators and assigns. This provision, far from burdening the public, or even their own estates, puts money into their own purse or that of their legal representatives. At the same time the labor market is replenished, the great staples of the country multiplied, the Constitution reinforced and the Union fortified. So true is the apothegm that "private vices are public benefits." But Roman examples like these are not to be looked for in corrupt and decaying monarchies like England. They are the out-growth of our own peculiar institutions, and should be the source of gratitude rather than of pride, in view of our superior advantages. In England William IV. pursued an unobjectionable course as to his Fitzclarences, endowing them only with his own honest savings, made for that purpose. And we presume the day is gone by when the illegitimate scions of royalty will be quartered on the public, as well as those lawfully begotten. Those last, if the £70,000 pension to the Princess Royal become a fact as it is now a rumor, will be as much as the broad and well-trimmed shoulders of John Bull can stagger

Mr. CULLEN of Delaware believed the House has jurisdiction to expel Mr. Brooks. While he regretted and his constituents disapproved the language uttered by Mr. Sumner, he was free to say that it did not justify Mr. Brooks in his conduct. He thought Mr. Edmundson should not be included in the majority resolution of censure, but that Mr. Brooks and Mr. Keitt should be punished, and he would give his vote in that direction.

Mr. ENGLISH of Indiana introduced an amendment to the majority resolution, expressing disapprobation of the assault and of the use of language

soon as may be in approval of this outrage upon the freedom of speech, and if it be not met with upon the wind of indignation and contempt by their constituents that will sweep them from public life, I have yet to know of what material they are made. Let Southern men deliberately justify and by their vote applaud this act: it will ring trumpet-tongued in shame to future generations. It shall be placed high on that dark catalogue where stand recorded the unnumbered murders of Lovejoy and Dow, and Barber, and Brown, where stand recorded countless crimes and indignities perpetrated upon all ages, sexes and conditions of men in which the aged and venerable Judge has been added to the voice of Massachusetts against a Government of crime.

to ask him a question? Was it to the first part of the speech which he had heard that he referred in the conversation with Gov. Brown, when he said: "When he delivered it, I determined to punish him?"

MR. BROOKS—I cannot pretend to be accurate. It was a loose conversation that I had with Gov. Brown. I had no opportunity to ask him any other